

Appl. No. : 09/828,550
Filed : April 6, 2001

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Drawings

In response to the drawing objection, Applicant respectfully notes that the "upwardly extending projection" is shown in Figure 1 of the drawings and identified with reference number 25. See also the Specification, at page 6, lines 18-20. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to the drawings was made in error and that a proposed drawing correction is not required in reply to this Office action.

Matters of Form

Claim 9 has been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. With respect to Claim 13, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to page 6, lines 18-25 and Figure 1. Applicant has also amended Claim 13 to more particularly and distinctly describe the claimed subject matter. Claim 12 has been deleted. Claims 6-8 and 47 have been amended to correct grammatical errors or redundant language.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-3, 9, 12 and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnsgard et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,691, herein "Johnsgard). Claims 4, 11, 13, 14 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Johnsgard in combination with Shih (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,691). Claims 5-8 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Johnsgard and Koike (U.S. Patent No. 5,065,698). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections. Nevertheless, to advance prosecution, Applicant has amended these claims but reserves the right to pursue these claims or claims of a similar scope in a continuing application.

As amended, Claim 1 recites, a "semiconductor processing apparatus comprising a reaction chamber and one or more vitreous components that have a support surface for supporting other components in the reaction chamber, said support surface being having an outer surface that is covered at least in part by a devitrification barrier coating that is bonded to said support surface and directly contacts said supported other components in the reaction chamber."

Appl. No. : 09/828,550
Filed : April 6, 2001

With respect to the anticipation rejections, Johnsgard does not disclose a semiconductor processing apparatus with the above-noted limitations. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that independent Claim 1 cannot be anticipated by Johnsgard.

Applicant also respectfully submits that, as amended, Claim 1 is not obvious over either the combinations of Johnsgard with Shih (U.S. Patent No. 6,342,691) or Koike (U.S. Patent No. 5,065,698). Specifically, Johnsgard teaches away from using a "devitrification barrier coating that is bonded to [a] support surface" because Johnsgard states that coating insulation walls with a reflective material such as silicon nitride produces a less durable alternative that "often flake and spall, and may interfere with the chemistry of some processes." Col. 17, lines 28-31. As such, one of skill in the relevant art, would not think to use a coating that "flakes and spalls" on a support surface that supports another component because contact with another component would tend to cause more flaking and spalling.

Claims 1-4, 9-14, and 47 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wengert (U.S. Patent No. 6,325,858, herein "Wengert"). Claims 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Wengert. Claims 46 and 48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Wengert in view of Koike.

With respect to the anticipation rejection, Applicant respectfully notes that Wengert does not disclose "a devitrification barrier coating that is bonded to said support surface" as recited in amended Claim 1. Instead, Wengert discloses a shield or cap 54 that is adapted to fit over the corresponding quartz component. Col. 7, lines 5-22.

With respect to the obviousness rejections, Applicant respectfully submits that there is simply no suggestion or teaching in the cited art to modify the shield or cap disclosed in Wengert so as to create a devitrification barrier coating that is bonded to said support surface.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-10, 13-14 and 46-48 depend upon allowable Claim 1 and for at least this reason are also in condition for allowance.

New Claims

Applicant has added new Claims 55-65. Claim 55 recites, "a semiconductor processing apparatus comprising a reaction chamber and a thermocouple, the thermocouple comprising a quartz sheath having an outer surface that is covered at least in part by a devitrification barrier coating having a thickness between about 1 and 10,000 angstroms." Applicant respectfully

Appl. N . : 09/828,550
Filed : April 6, 2001

submits that the cited art does not disclose either alone or in combination a semiconductor processing apparatus with the above-noted limitations. For at least this reason, Applicant submits that Claim 55 is in condition for allowance. Claims 56-65 are also in condition for allowance because *inter alia*, they depend upon allowable Claim 55.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: May 15, 2003

By: Rabinder N. Narula

Rabinder N. Narula
Registration No. 53,371
Attorney of Record
2040 Main Street
Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 760-0404

FAX RECEIVED
MAY 16 2003
GROUP 1700

H:\DOCS\RN\NAR\NN-6458.DOC
051203